## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA NORTHERN DIVISION



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CR 03-30103

Plaintiff,

SECOND

\*

ORDER AND OPINION ON MOTION FOR COPIES OF DOCUMENTS

PAVIT VIT XAYPHANTHO,

-VS-

\*

Defendant.

\*

transcripts, and discovery material. That motion was denied (Doc. 226) based upon lack of jurisdiction. Defendant has filed another motion (Doc. 229) for copies of the same documents previously requested. Pursuant to Rule 6 of the Rules Governing § 2255 Proceedings, a petitioner may invoke the discovery process with leave of Court. However, there is no § 2255 proceeding pending. Defendant has until August 29, 2005, within which to file a § 2255 motion. 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Defendant's criminal case is closed. Therefore, this Court has no jurisdiction to rule on defendant's motion. <u>United States v. Gleason</u>, 753 F.2d 83, 85 (8th Cir. 1985). Defendant may contact the Clerk's office to make arrangements to prepay for copies of his file. There were no transcripts prepared of his plea or sentencing hearings.

IT IS ORDERED that defendant's motion (Doc. 229) for copies is denied.

Dated this **28** Tay of June, 2005.

BY THE COURT:

CHARLES B. KORNMANN

U.S. District Judge

ATTEST:

JOSEPH HAXS, CLERK

)

(SEAL)